(6)

Proteus Redivivus:

OR, THE

Turner of Turners-hall

Truly Repreſented;

And the ABUSES and FALSEHOODS

OF

George Keith's

Fourth Narrative,

So far as they concern the Author,

EXAMIN'D and DETECTED.

By *Daniel Phillips*, M. D.

Proverbs 24. 8.

He that deviſeth to do Evil, ſhall be called a miſchievous Perſon.

Can any thing be ſpoken or written in words, ſo clear from Ambiguity, which a Perverſe or Prejudiced Mind ſhall not be able to vex, and force to another Meaning? *Arch-biſhop* Tillotſon's *Works*, P. 680.

Qui aliquid ſtatuit, parte inaudita altera,
Æquum licet ſtatuerit, haud æquus fuit. Sen. Tragœd.

LONDON, Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle*, in *White-Hart-Court* in *Gracious-ſtreet*, 1700.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

Chriſtian Reader,

WE are ſo far from affecting Obſcurity in our *Credenda*, that could there be found a way to render our *Principles* as eaſily obvious to thy Underſtanding, as there is of our *Actions* to the *Eye*, we ſhould be extreamly well ſatisfied; not doubting but thou wouldeſt have as favourable an Opinion of the firſt, as of the laſt. But if thou doſt only ſee with other Mens Eyes, and judge by other Mens Underſtandings, even thoſe whoſe Intereſt, it may be, is, to put a *Bears Skin* on us, I am no ways ſurpriſed, if thou haſt ill Sentiments of *Quakeriſm*, ſo called. Did I believe that People held ſuch *Tenets* as their Adverſaries inſinuate, I ſhould abominate it from my very Soul; but I do cer-

tainly know, they are groſly miſrepreſented, and ſo may'ſt thou, if thou haſt but ſo much Patience, or canſt ſpare ſo much time, as to read and conſider their approved * *Authors*, as many have done (ſince *G. K.* the *Snake*, &c. began their Malicious Clamours againſt them) to their intire Satisfaction; ſaying, *What Falſe Stories have we heard of the* Quakers! *We could not have believed that they are ſo Sound in the* Chriſtian Faith, *had not we diſcourſed them about their* Principles, *and read their Books; therefore for the future, we are reſolved never to credit any Reports concerning them, till we have examined the Truth of them.* This Examination of our *Principles*, and reading of our *Books*, hath been of ſingular Service; for many thereby have been lately convinced of the *Truth*, amongſt which numbers, are ſeveral Miniſters, and other Learned Men, of divers Profeſſions. By this it is evident, that what our Enemies deſigned for an Obſtruction to the *Truth*, thro' *Divine Providence* is turned extreamly to the Advantage of it.

* R. B's *Apology*. W. P's *Key*, &c.

Had *G. K.* or any other of our Adverſaries, that have lately written againſt us, intended it only in order to reform us in ſuch *Tenets*, as they imagined, we were Erroneous, they ſhould, in my Opinion, have conſidered our *Principles*, as explained by our ſelves, and our words, in the Senſe we uſe them; and in that Senſe have demonſtrated their Oppoſition to the *Doctrines* contained in the *Holy Scriptures*. Had they done thus, we might have acknowledged their Kindneſs towards us; but if they think, by their falſe Inferences, to perſwade us, that we hold *Principles*, whereof we were altogether Ignorant, till they affirmed that they were our *Tenets*; or to alter our *Sentiments*, by the apparent Gloſſes and falſe Turns they give our Sayings, they will

will be miſtaken, becauſe we are ſatisfied, this is a Method calculated by ſome deſigning Perſons, rather to raiſe Heats and Animoſities, and to excite the *Magiſtrates* to *Perſecution*, than to reform our Judgments, wherein they ſuggeſt we are Erroneous.

To leave the Truth of their Allegations againſt us, to the Deciſion of ſome Moderate Men, that are either *Epiſcopalians*, *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, or *Baptiſts*, hath at the firſt glance ſome ſhew of Fairneſs: But if we ſeriouſly conſider the Propoſal, nothing is more Unreaſonable, than to expect that we ſhould leave the Determination of our Cauſe, to thoſe Men that are, or have been, our Accuſers, and have long ſince pre-judged both it and our ſelves. Will the *Epiſcopalians* ſtand to the Award of the *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Baptiſts*, whether there were any *Lord Archbiſhops*, *Lord Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, *Deacons*, (as an *Order* Prior to *Prieſthood*) *Arch-Deacons*, &c. or any *Common-Prayer-Book*, *Sprinkling of Infants*, Signing of them in the Forehead with the *Sign of the Croſs*, and the Uſe of *Godfathers* and *Godmothers*, as they call them, in the *Apoſtles* days? Or any *Fonts*, *Surplices*, *Organs*, *Choriſters*, &c. in their Times? Will the *Presbyterians* ſtand to the Arbitration of the *Epiſcopalians*, whether *Biſhops* are an *Order* diſtinct from, and ſuperior to *Presbyters*, *Jure Divino*? Will the *Baptiſts* abide by the Determination of the *Epiſcopalians*, *Presbyterians*, and *Independents*, whether *Water-Baptiſm* ought to be adminiſtred by *Dipping* only, and not by *Sprinkling* or *Pouring* alſo? Or whether Adult Perſons only, ought to be admitted to *Water-Baptiſm*, upon Profeſſion of their Faith, and not the Infants of Profeſſing Parents? If none of theſe will admit one Party's Judgment concluſive againſt the Opinion of the other, what reaſon then is there

for the *Quakers* to admit Men of another Perſwaſion to be their Judges, as long as they ſubmit their *Doctrines* to the Teſt of the *Holy Scriptures?* I confeſs I ſee none; what thou may'ſt, *Reader*, is difficult for me to determine.

Poſſibly, *Reader*, thou may'ſt be one of thoſe, whoſe Opinion is, that we ſhould Retract ſome Paſſages in our ancient Friends Books, (as *G. K.* hath done in his) and then all would be well, not doubting but thou wilt allow, as one of the *Norfolk* Prieſts at *Weſt-Dereham* did, that the *Quakers* of this Generation are Orthodox; and that thou deſireſt nothing more of the *Quakers*, but that they ſhould Retract ſome Expreſſions in their old Writings, and then thou wouldſt recognize them as *Proteſtant Diſſenters.* To thee I reply, That as long as moſt of the Sentences oppugn'd by our Adverſaries, and juſtified by us, have either been ſufficiently explained already in ſome other part of the ſame Author's Works, or in ſome other Books of our *Friends*, there can be no need of an *Index Expurgatorius.*

And as *G. K.* hath vindicated moſt that hath been formerly objected againſt us as Erroneous, ſo I am confident the latter pretended Diſcoveries may be; if our Opponents will but grant us the ſame liberty to defend our deceaſed Friends Writings, that Biſhop *Kidder* takes, to defend the *New Teſtament* againſt the Objections of the *Jews.* If this may be admitted, as 'tis preſumed no Chriſtan will deny it, then 'tis not doubted, but a Senſe Analogous to the *Doctrines* contained in the *Scriptures*, may be given to all our *Ancient Friends Writings.*

What

What concerns *G. K.*'s *Retractations*, whereof he now makes a great Noiſe, I imagined that the Biſhop which Ordained him, would have obliged him to a more particular *Recantation*; eſpecially as to his former Severe Cenſures of that Church, whereof now he is a Pretended Member, e'er he would have imployed him as an *Itinerant Preacher*; becauſe, ſhould they be but ſuperficially ſurveyed, his particular ones, which are but few, would appear little more than *Explications* adapted to his Private Deſigns; and his general one (* *I ſubmit all that I have at any time given forth, in Word, Writ or Print, by way of Doctrine in Religious Matters, to the Teſt, Touch-ſtone and Rule of the Scriptures*—*Renouncing, Revoking, Retracting, Diſowning and Denying, whatever is contained in any of my former or latter Books, that doth not perfectly agree with the Holy Scriptures,*) is no more, as I verily believe, than any *Quaker* will readily do. * *Retract.* P. 42.

Had *G. K.* been really convinced, he had acted the Part of a *Sophiſter*, in defending the *Quakers* Opinion, by putting falſe Gloſſes on the *Scriptures*, or by uſing any inconcluſive *Arguments*; he ſhould (as I conceive) have been as particular in his *Retractations*, as he was in his *Vindications* of them; and ingenuouſly have demonſtrated, wherein each particular Perverſion of the *Scriptures*, and every Numerical *Sophiſm* did conſiſt. Till this is done, his former (now the *Quakers*) *Arguments*, are as good a Defence for them, againſt him, or any other Adverſary, as formerly when he was one of them. 'Tis not enough, in my Thoughts, for *G. K.* (when his own *Arguments* are urged againſt him) in general, to ſay, *I have Retracted, I have Retracted them*; *and that 'tis great Impudence in any, to*

object

object againſt me, what I have long ſince Retracted. We do not conſider them now, only as *G. K.*'s, but as our own Reaſons; and might have uſed them, had he never been known, nor any of his Books ſeen by us; and we may preſume to uſe any, or all the *Arguments* (which he hath formerly Printed) in our Defence, let him mutter never ſo much, till he, or ſome of his Adherents, ſhall ſhew their Inconcluſiveneſs.

I am ſenſible, *Reader*, that many are (perchance thou art alſo) of opinion, that *G. K.* hath diſcovered monſtrous *Errors* amongſt the *Quakers*, that were never detected before; and indeed he ſeems to inſinuate as much, in his *Advertiſement* to his *Fourth Narrative*, by ſaying, *It is my purpoſe to detect and diſcover Groſs Errors, and Antichriſtian Principles*, &c. Whereby thou mighteſt be apt to inferr, he was an *Original*, and not a *Tranſcriber*. To undeceive thee in this matter, I ſhall ſubject to thy Conſideration, what one (tho' I might, what one Hundred) of their Oppoſers ſaid of them, above Forty Years ſince, conceiving thou canſt diſcover *Ex ungue Leonem*. And that thou may'ſt the more eaſily perceive the Harmony (not to ſay *Plagiaſm*) of *G. K.* with one *Jonathan Clapham*, (who writ a Book, ſtiled, *A Full Diſcovery, and Confutation, of the Wicked and Damnable Doctrines of the* Quakers, *&c.* and dedicated it to *Oliver Cromwel*, then *Lord Protector*, Printed *Anno* 1656.) I ſhall ſet Eight of *G. K.*'s Ten Calumnies, as they are Printed in an *Advertiſement* prefixed to his *Fourth Narrative*, in a Column oppoſite to what *J. C.* alſo falſly affirmed, that their Agreement may the eaſier be perceived.

J. C.

J. C. in the aboveſaid Book, pretends to prove the *Quakers* guilty of,

1. *Being Enemies to the Holy Scriptures.*
2. *Denying Chriſt come in the Fleſh, his Death, Reſurrection,* &c.
3. *Denying the Doctrine of the Trinity.*
4. *Holding Equality with God, and the Soul to be one Being with God.*
5. *Corrupting the Doctrine of Juſtification.*
6. *Denying the Reſurrection of the Body, laſt Judgment, Heaven and Hell.*
7. *Being Enemies to all the Ordinances of Jeſus Chriſt.*
8. *Being no Friends to the Lord's day, making all days alike.*
9. *Pretending to Miracles.*
10. *Being no truly Mortified Perſons, notwithſtanding Pretences thereunto; and how Popiſh Monks have out-ſtripped them therein.*
11. *Deſtroying the True Doctrine of Sanctification.*
12. *Being the common Sink of all the Hereſies of our Times; and how they agree with former Hereticks in many Particulars; and are Enemies to all Civility and good Manners; and to avoid them, as Pernicious Enemies to the Souls of Men, and to have no Communion with them,* &c.

G. K. Inſinuates, that the Errors he intends to diſcover the *Quakers* guilty of, * are,

1. *Concerning the Scriptures.*
2. *Concerning Chriſt's Incarnation, his Soul, and Body, and Blood, his coming to Judgment at the laſt day.*
3. *Concerning the Holy Trinity.*
4. *Concerning the Soul.*
5. *Concerning Juſtification.*
6. *Concerning the Reſurrection.*
7. *Concerning Outward Baptiſm and the Supper.*
8. *Concerning doing Servile Work on the Lord's day.*

* *In his Advertiſement to his 4th Narrative.*

The

The Analogy that here is between the Contents of *G. K.*'s *Fourth Narrative*, and *J. Clapham*'s Book, is ſo conſpicuous, that ſome may be induced to think, he borrowed a great deal of his Darkneſs from this Book, in compoſing his laſt *Narrative:* But waving that, 'tis undeniable that the Principal Errors pretended, which *G. K.* and others now advance againſt the *Quakers*, are moſtly contained in this Treatiſe of *J. C.* If ſo, it conſequentially follows, that they were forged long before *G. K.* was a *Quaker*. How then it ſhould happen, ſeeing theſe Objections were ſo publickly Printed, that he ſhould live (as now he pretends) Thirty Years in Ignorance of them, is ſo ſurpriſing, that it gains little Credit with me; how much it doth with thee, I ſhall not determine.

In fine, It may be obvious to any, that have the Opportunity of reading our old Adverſary's Books, that there is little now objected againſt the *Quakers*, but what is a Reiteration of things falſly affirmed of them, and anſwered by them, Thirty or Forty Years ſince. If *G. K.* (who is, by ſome, thought to have made the greateſt Diſcoveries of their Errors) ſhould have his Writings deplumed of all the Feathers, which his Envious Predeceſſors have made uſe of againſt them, his Circumſtances would not be much unlike that of the *Crow* in the Fable; and under the ſame Predicament, may be comprehended moſt of the Modern Writers againſt them: As can be demonſtrated by thy Sincere Friend

London, Septemb. 4. 1700.

D. P.

Proteus

Proteus Redivivus:

OR,

The TURNER of *Turner's-Hall*

Truly Repreſented, *&c.*

THAT Perſons who have been Baniſhed a Society, whether Civil or Religious, for their Irregularities, ſhould afterwards uſe their utmoſt Efforts, to excite the Enemies of ſuch a Communion, to diſturb its Peace; is (as Hiſtory relates) ſo natural to Exiles, that I am ſubject to imagine, few will be ſurprized, either to hear, or ſee *G. K.* ſo Sedulous in perverting the *Quaker's* Books, violating their Senſe, and ridiculing their Perſons; when they have a true Idea of the real Motives, which induced him to be ſo maliciouſly Clamorous againſt them.

It was not my Deſign, to have concerned my ſelf in this publick Controverſie; (neither do I now intend to go much further than I am actually concerned) would *G. K.* have anſwered my Letter delivered to him, or given me a Meeting as he promiſed, or Perſonally acknowledged he was Miſtaken, and had not deſignedly miſ-repreſented my Words: But ſeeing this could not be obtained, to undeceive his Reader, I ſhall here expoſe to his view and conſideration, a brief Account of the Subſtance of the Diſcourſe, that paſſed between *G. K.* his abetting Miniſters, and my Self, at *Turner's Hall*, with ſome Obſervations on his *Fourth Narrative*, relating thereunto. And that I may not be altogether Immethodical, I ſhall conſider every Paragraph (wherein I find my Name ſpecified) in the ſame order as they are printed in his *Narrative*, beginning with p. 21.

* Fourth Narr. p. 21.

* A *Quaker*, call'd *D. Phillips*, ſtanding by, near where I ſtood, ſaid, *That Book* (i. e. The Way caſt up) *was approved by the Second-Days-Meeting at* London, *which was* **a great Untruth**. *I told how I wrote that Book in* Scotland, *and from* Scotland *ſent it to a Correſpondent in* Holland, *who printed it there; and when it came over to* London, *in the Year* 1678. *it met with great Oppoſition from divers of the Preachers of the* Quakers, *at* London; *as* Steven Criſp, William Shewen, William Mead, *and* Samuel Newton.

Obſer. I could deny what he aſſerts of me here to be True, becauſe of ſome Additions. This Miſtake I would rather impute to that Officious Perſon, that gave him the Relation of what I ſaid, than to any deſign in *G. K.* to miſ-repreſent my Words; being well ſatisfied, he cannot ſay, he heard me ſpeak any thing like it. For, when I ſpoke to ſome that were by me, concerning that Book, I ſtood in a Corner behind him; ſo that he could neither conveniently ſee or hear me, becauſe he was then directing his Diſcourſe to his Auditory, that was before him.

But, admitting it for granted, that I did ſay his Book, call'd, *The Way caſt up, was approved by the Second-Days-Meeting at* London: I am apt to think, no unprejudiced Perſon will aſſert I am guilty of a great Untruth (*i. e.* great Lye) for ſaying, that *That Book was approved by the Second-Days-Meeting at* London; when he hath Read what *G. K.* ſaith concerning that very Book, in the *Defence of the Snake*, and duly conſidered the Reaſons advanced by him, here to prove it.

The *Firſt* Reaſon whereby he would inſinuate, that I am guilty of a great Untruth, ſeems to run thus; *That Book was Writ in* Scotland, *Printed in* Holland; and therefore could not be Cenſured by the Second-Days-Meeting at *London*. Is it not poſſible, that a Book may be Writ in the *Eaſt-Indies*, Printed in the *Weſt-Indies*, yet may be approved or diſapproved of in *London*? The inconcluſiveneſs of this Argument is ſo obvious, that I am of Opinion it would be nauſeous to the Reader, to detain him any longer thereon: Therefore ſhall proceed to his

Second, *When it* (i. e. The Way caſt up) *came over to* London, *in the Year* 1678. *it met with great Oppoſition from divers of the Preachers of the* Quakers, *at* London. Under this extenſive term, *Divers*, only Four are here included, and that is the greateſt number that I have heard, did then object againſt any of the

the Expreſſions contained in that Book. Should all that he aſſerteth on this Subject be Credited as Truth, (tho' at the ſame time, I have great cauſe to ſuſpect his Sincerity in this Matter, becauſe in other Relations he has Printed Notorious Falſhoods) it would affect the whole Body of *Quakers* no more, than if any ſhould prove there were Four Miniſters of the Church of *England*, ſo call'd, that were *Socinians*, would affect the whole Epiſcopal Clergy in *England*; neither do I conceive he would have continued Fourteen Years after this, Strenuouſly defending their Principles as *Orthodox*, or have ſaid, as he doth in his Preface to his *Serious Appeal*, Printed in *Penſilvania* 1692. which is Fourteen Years after the Conference about this Book was managed, viz. * *It never yet hath been proved, nor ever will be, that the Religion profeſſed by the Sincere and Faithful People, called in Scorn* Quakers, *is either Paganiſm, or any other thing than real Chriſtianity*, had he not been Convinced; that they held no ſuch Errors, as by wreſting of their Words he would now inſinuate.

* Preface to the *Serious Appeal.*

Had he deſerted their Society immediately after this Conference, it might have had ſome ſhadow of Reaſon, to induce ſome to Credit this Story concerning our above-nominated Four Friends; but I can ſcarce have ſo hard Thoughts of him, as to imagine he would have tarried amongſt them ſo many Years after this Conference, had theſe Men Opinions, as here related by him, been the avowed Principles of the *Quakers*, as now he ſeems to aſſert. I am ſo far from an Opinion, that he deſerted them on this Account, that I believe, had he not been Expell'd their Society, he would not have diveſted himſelf of the Title of a *Quaker* to this Day; becauſe ſeveral Years after he was Exiled their Communion for ſome Irregularities, he own'd himſelf to be a *Quaker*; which is almoſt a Demonſtration to me, that he did not think Antichriſtian Doctrines Eſſential to *Quakeriſm*, ſo call'd. My Sentiments are, that he kept that Title as long as he was in any hopes of gaining a Party of them, or any others, to ſide with him; but finding his greateſt Endeavours to divide them Fruitleſs, and it may be his Neceſſities very preſſing, partly out of Revenge, and partly through the Charms of a good Stipend, he makes his Intentions known to ſome of the Church of *England*, ſo call'd, who willingly received him; not, as I am ſubject to believe, out of any great Eſteem of his Sincerity; but having a deſign againſt the

Quakers, &c. they thought him a Tool, as well qualified, to ſtir up Perſecution againſt them, as any.

But to return, to what more immediately concerns my ſelf, *viz.* to prove that Book (*i. e. The Way caſt up*) was approved of by a Meeting of Friends, I could produce a Cloud of Witneſſes; but doubting the *Narrator* will inſinuate his Old Friends are now become his Enemies; and therefore their Evidence againſt him is not to be Credited; I ſhall omit theirs, and only recite what *G. K.* ſaith (conceiving he will not eat his own Words) concerning this *Treatiſe*, in the Defence of the *Snake*: his Partiality therein I ſhall not now determine, but ſhall ſuſpend till I have ſeen his Oppo-

* Defence of the *Snake*, p. 25.

nents Anſwer; his Words are, * *In the Concluſion (after there had been two Meetings about it) the Perſons that had accuſed me, were deſired by the* **Meeting**, *to deſiſt from their Charge, and ſay nothing againſt the Book* (i. e. The Way caſt up;) *and whereas ſome Friends that were diſſatisfied at my Book, had forbidden the Stationer in* George-yard *to ſell it, becauſe it was Unſound: Order was given by the* **Meeting**, *that the Stationer might be encouraged to Sell it, that it might have its Service in City and Country, as according was done.* It is to be obſerv'd, that there is but one Meeting amongſt Friends, that doth actually concern themſelves about Printing, *&c.* of Books; if this Relation of *G. K.* is true, how am I guilty then of a great Untruth, I leave to the Conſideration of the Unprejudiced to give in their Verdict.

I ſhall conclude my Obſervations on this Paragraph, with one Argument, *ad hominem*, whereby I am induced to believe, that if one of *G. K's.* Inferences is concluſive; it will undeniably follow, that all the *Orthodox Doctrines*, &c. contained in any of his Books, that have been Countenanced by the Second-Days-Meeting at *London*, and have been allowed to be ſold by the *Quakers* there, are to be Eſteemed as their Principles from

* Antich. and Sadd. p. 5.

theſe following Words: * *Seeing the Second-Days-Meeting at* London *hath Countenanced his* (i. e. Caleb Puſey's) *Book, and the* Quakers *generally at* London, *allow it to be ſold next Door to their Meeting-Houſe in* Grace-Church-ſtreet; *they make his Ignorance, Unbelief, Sadduciſm and Antichriſtian Doctrine, to be theirs*: Then with a parity of Reaſon, all the Knowledge, Orthodox Faith, and Chriſtian Doctrine, that is contained in *G. K.* or any other perſon's Books, that have been Countenanced by the

the Second-Days-Meeting at *London*, or are generally allowed to be ſold next Door to their Meeting-Houſe in *Grace-Church-ſtreet*, are theirs.

I asked D. Phillips *what he ſaid to my former Queſtion, Did Men by their Sins really wound God in them, as ſome of their Preachers have affirmed? After ſome demur, he ſaid, he would not give a poſitive Anſwer, but take it into further Conſideration; whereupon ſome of the Auditory did commend him.* Fourth Narr. p. 58.

Obſer. My Anſwer to his Query, is here miſ-ſtated, whether Deſignedly or Accidentally, I ſhall not poſitively affirm; but this I can ſay, He hath not related one Sentence in *Terminis*, as it was delivered by me: Therefore to undeceive his Reader, I ſhall give him a Summary Account, why a *Prieſt* did ſpeak favourably of an Anſwer I gave, which was on this occaſion; *G. K.* holding a little Book in his Hand, read a Paſſage in it, as ſoon as he had done reading it, he asked my Opinion thereof: I replyed,

D. P. I muſt take time to Conſider it.

Miniſt. *That is Modeſtly ſaid.*

Another Miniſter, *But you ſhould either have owned or diſowned it.*

D. P. Would it have been Prudence in any Man, hitherto Juſtifie or Condemn a Book, meerly on the reading of one or two Lines of it, without conſidering the Context, Scope, or Drift of the Author?

Miniſt. *But you ſhould have conſider'd this Book.*

D. P. I do not know where to procure it.

Miniſt. *You may have it at Mrs.* Sowle's.

D. P. I am ſatisfied of the contrary; becauſe moſt of theſe Books here produced, were out of Print before I was Born; and if I would give Ten times their value, I do not know where to buy them.

If thou wilt but oblige us ſo far, as to give us the ſame liberty to defend our Antient Friends Books, that Biſhop *Kidder* takes in defending the Holy Scriptures againſt the *Jews*; I doubt not, but we may eaſily defend our Antient Friends Writings againſt all the Cavils of our Mercenary Adverſaries.

Miniſt. *But who can tell where to have you, ſeeing you may hereafter ſee cauſe otherwiſe to Word the Matter, and yet your Intentions the ſame?*

D. P.

D. P. Yes indeed, we can ſometimes uſe *Neco*, othertimes *Occido*, and yet intend the ſame thing; conceiving *Neco* and *Occido* to be Synonymous Terms: and I am apt to think, that variety of Synonymous Expreſſions, is acceptable to moſt Readers.

Obſer. I always was, and yet am of Opinion, that it was, and alſo is a great hardſhip, for any Subject to be tried as a Criminal, without a Copy of his Indictment, even for a Fact that he himſelf hath Committed: But a Barbarity, nay, a Tyranny not to be Parallell'd, to impeach a Man, and try him as an Offender for a Fact, his Anceſtors, or ſome Friend of his Communion perpetrated, and it may be before he was Born, without favouring him with the ſight of what he is in particular, not in general Terms to be tried for. This was the State of the Caſe of the Poor *Quakers* at *Weſt-Dereham*; they were there to be Tryed, Judged, and Condemned by their *profeſſed Enemies*, for pretended Blaſphemies, which their deceaſed or abſent Friends were affirmed to be Guilty of; and moſt, if not all, their pretended Proofs, were to be taken out of certain Old Books, and Manuſcripts: A Copy whereof was often (and in the Opinion of very Judicious Perſons, juſtly) by the *Quakers* deſired, nevertheleſs it was as often by the *Arbitrary Prieſt* denied. To this Method of indicting People in general Termes, *G. K.* is no Stranger.

How eaſie is it for a Critick to pick and cull a Sentence, or by ſplitting it in two, to render it thereby Obnoxious to the Ears of an Auditory; to which as I conceive, it would not be Prudence for any Man to give a preſent Anſwer, until he had maturely conſider'd the Context, Scope, and Intent of the Author? How Unjuſt, how Illegal, how Arbitrary then is it for *G. K.* or any other, to demand a direct Anſwer, to a particular Sentence pick'd out of a Book, which his Reſpondent never ſaw before; I leave to the Determination of every moderate Man.

Would our Adverſaries grant us that favour, which I am confident they would expect (if not demand) from their Opponents, being as it appears to me, nothing but a right. All Authors are Intituled to, *viz.* where a Writer treats on any Subject Conciſely or Dubiouſly, if the ſame Perſon Writes on the ſame Matter, more Prolixly and Perſpicuouſly in ſome other part of his Works, that is to be the Standard, whereby the former is to be regulated.

If

If this would be admitted, I doubt not but to demonſtrate, that all our Primitive Friends were found in the Chriſtian Faith, even in expreſs Terms, as worded by themſelves; but it hath been our Lot, to have our Writings wreſted by our Enemies, to the worſt (whereas Chriſtian Charity ſhould have given them the beſt) Senſe they will bear, and many times directly contrary to the Scope, Intent, and formal Expreſſions of the ſame Author, in ſome other Page of his Writings. The very Errors of the Preſs, I am ſatisfied, are imputed to us, as often as they render the Senſe Obnoxious.

Should any without Prejudice, ſeriouſly conſider that noted Expreſſion of *G. F.* which was objected againſt him as a vile Error, about 45 Years ſince by his Adverſaries; and as I am ſubject to believe, hath been Reprinted againſt us, with the greateſt Aggravations imaginable, a Hundred times as a moſt horrid Error, viz. * *He that hath the ſame Spirit that raiſed up Jeſus Chriſt, is equal with God*; may eaſily by conſidering the Context, and the Text of Scripture, there cited in the Margin (Rom. 8. 11. *But if the Spirit of him that raiſed up Jeſus from the Dead, dwell in you; he that raiſed up Chriſt from the Dead, ſhall alſo quicken your mortal Bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you*) determine what he meant, and that there is a word or two, either Redundant or Deficient; take away what is Redundant (i. e. *he that hath*) and it will read thus, *The ſame Spirit that raiſed up Jeſus Chriſt, is Equal with God*; or ſupply the Deficiency with the Addition of (*hath what*) and it will run thus, *He that hath the ſame Spirit that raiſed up Jeſus Chriſt* (hath what) *is Equal with God.* I am induced to imagine, that there rather is a Deficiency than a Redundancy, becauſe the Book is very ill Printed, and I obſerve there are ſeveral Words omitted in it, to make the Diſcourſe Senſe; in the Line precedent to this, is a Quotation out of the Scriptures, in which there is a word omitted, which could not be deſignedly, becauſe it doth not any ways alter the Senſe of the Text; that *G. Fox* attributes an Equality with God, to nothing in Man, but to the Holy Spirit, is obvious to any unbiaſſed Perſon, that will attentively read, and duly conſider the drift of his Diſcourſe in this, or any other of his Books; look back to p. 5. of the ſame Treatiſe, and there, *ex profeſſo*, he anſwereth the ſame Objection. He being then accuſed by the *Lancaſhire* Petition, that he profeſſed and avowed that he *was Equal with God*; His own

* *Saul's* Errand, p. 8.

Saul's Errand, p. 5.

own Answer there is, *It was not so spoken that* G. F. *was equal with God, but that the Father and the Son is One.* Six Lines under this *G. F.* saith, *The same Spirit, where it is, is equal with God.* And in p. 10. he repeats again almost the same words, near the foot of that Page. Being accused of the same thing, *i. e. That he was equal with God, by one* C. Wade. His Answer was, * *All that have the Son and the Holy Ghost, have that which is equal in Power and Glory with the Father.* And by the Text of Scripture cited by *G. F.* in the Margin, and these Quotations out of his own Writings it is undeniable, that he attributed *Equality solely to the Spirit of God and Christ in Man,* and *not to any thing in Man, simply considered as Man, without the Indwelling of the Holy Ghost.* They that have been concerned in Printing, will not think it impossible for an Error to happen in a Book; *the Printed Errata's* are an undeniable Witness thereof, either from the unfairness of the Copy, or from the heedlessness of the Corrector, especially in the absence of the Author; and it is not unknown to many, that *G. F.* was generally in Prison, or in the Country, when his Books were a Printing.

** Great Mystery, p. 248.*

I see no occasion to deny, that some of our Writings may be Elliptical, seeing the Scriptures are also under the same Predicament, if we may credit Bishop *Kidder* in his Demonstration of the *Messias*; * *where he produces some Quotations out of the Holy Scriptures,* where he saith, the word **only** is vertually included, tho' not verbally express'd: If the *Quakers* have in like manner, in some places omitted the word **only**, I hope they are not guilty of an unpardonable Error: Neither is a Book to be rejected (if I were to give in my Verdict) because there may be some Difficulties, or seeming Inconsistencies in it. Where is that Author, even amongst the Learned *Rabbies* of this Age, that hath so Clear and so Logical a Head, as to be able to word his matter so nicely, that a Critick cannot observe a Flaw in his Writings? If they that have all the advantages of Education, are liable to have their words wrested to a Sense they never Dream'd of; who then can imagine that the Illiterate Man's Sayings will be exempted from the like Inconveniencies?

* Part II. p. 129.*

Are the Scriptures (which by all Christians are allowed to be dictated by the eternal Spirit) totally free from Difficulties or seeming Inconsistencies? For deciding this Matter, Let us hear what the Learned Bishop *Kidder* saith: * *They are very weak and foolish Men, who will renounce the whole Religion, because there are some things said or taught in it, which they are not*

* Demon. Mes. P. II. p. 129.*

not able to comprehend, or give an account of. There are many Difficulties in the Old Teſtament, and ſeeming Contradictions, and yet both the Jews *and* Chriſtians, *do with great Reaſon receive thoſe Books with great Veneration. It were a very eaſie thing to perplex a learned* Jew *with many Difficulties, to be found in the Books of* Moſes, *of* Samuel, *the* Kings *and* Chronicles——*but he will not therefore doubt of the whole, becauſe he is not able to give a clear account of thoſe difficult Paſſages which are found therein.* What he ſaith here of the Old, he grants the ſame of the New Teſtament.

That lately common (tho' in my Opinion) ſilly Objection *i. e. That I may ſee cauſe otherwiſe to word the Matter, and yet my intention be the ſame*; Were they only illiterate Creatures that Objected this as an Heretical ſaying againſt the *Quakers*, I ſhould not be ſurprized at it: but for Men of Letters, who have been Educated at the Univerſities (as moſt of the Miniſters of the National Church have been) to recite this as a Notorious Crime in them, is a ſign of a diſingenuous *Nature*, if they are found tardy in the ſame thing.

G. K. to expoſe the *Quakers*, or Himſelf, in his late Broad Sheet, Entituled, *A Serious Call to the* Quakers, *&c.* under the head of Vile and Monſtrous Doctrines, Principles, and Uncharitable Sayings, hath cited this ſaying of *G. W.* viz. * *I may ſee cauſe otherwiſe to word the Matter, and yet my Intention be the ſame*; Is this a Vile and Monſtrous Doctrine? Is this a Vile and Monſtrous Principle, or an Uncharitable ſaying? Under which of theſe three Heads to reduce it, I do confeſs I am at a loſs; and if *G. K.* would ſo far oblige me, as to tell me under which of them it is to be placed; I ſhall acknowledge it as ſome part of a Satisfaction for telling his Auditory at *Turner's-Hall*, That I was a **Fool**. A few Lines under this Citation, *G. K.* (it may be fearing his ſingle affirmation would not be Credited) borrows the Names of Three Doctors, and Five Maſters of Arts, of the Church of *England*, ſo called, to Co-atteſt the Truth of this, and ſome other Citations.

* Count. Conv. p. 12.

I am ſatisfied, the *Quakers* will never ſee Cauſe to retract this ſaying of *G. W. viz. I may ſee cauſe otherwiſe to word the Matter, and yet my intention be the ſame*: if wording a Subject differently is an Antichriſtian act; how Guilty then are your School-Maſters, *&c.* who daily teach their Scholars not to uſe the ſame Term, or reiterate the ſame Phraſe in any *Epiſtle*

Theme, Copy of Verſes, or Declamation they Compoſe; but as often as they are barren of Synonymous *Terms* or *Phraſes*, to fertilize their Mind, they are order'd to have recourſe to *Gradus ad Parnaſſum*, *Wincheſter* Phraſes, *&c.* which are Books Compoſed only for that intent. If theſe Treatiſes are Pernicious to the Chriſtian Religion, let them be exiled the Schools; and let thoſe that preſume to Print them be Excommunicated. But ſhould we view *G. K*'s Writings, or theſe Eight Miniſter's Sermons; I am ſubject to believe they will be found Wording their Matter differently, when they would repreſent the ſame Notions to their Auditory. I am far from Cenſuring them for it, becauſe in my Opinion 'tis a qualification neceſſary for all *Authors* and *Orators*. I doubt not, tho' they reprehend this as an Error in the *Quakers*; yet they eſteem copiouſneſs of Expreſſions commendable in others: But why that which is a Vertue in ſome, ſhould be a Vice in others; or that which is Laudable in a *Church-man*, ſhould be culpable in a *Quaker*, is ſo abſurd a Notion, that I think it needleſs farther to conſider it here; But ſhall proceed to p. 63.

Here a Quaker *D. P. Objected, That Diſputants might differ about the Subject of the Diſpute, ſo as the Opponent might mean one thing, and the Reſpondent another: But I anſwer'd, They might ſo, when the Matter is intricate and obſcure by ambiguities of Words: But it could not be ſo here, the Subject of the Diſpute being ſo clearly propoſed, that none but a Sot or Cheat could, or would miſtake the Subject.*

Obſer. Theſe Words were not repeated here by *G. K.* as they were deliver'd by me; nevertheleſs I ſhall not much blame him, as long as he gives my meaning, tho' not my Words. I was then, and am now of Opinion, that Diſputants might, and often did differ, more through the Equivocalneſs of Terms by them uſed, than through any real difference in their Sentiments, when the preciſe Signification of their Words was once ſettled; and *G. K.* here grants, *That Diſputants might differ about the Subject of the Diſpute, when the Matter is Intricate and Obſcure, by ambiguities of Words:* But ſaith, *It could not be ſo here.* For which Reaſon, it will be neceſſary to conſider the Subject of the Controverſie, between *G. Fox* and *Magnus Bine*, and then the Unbiaſſed Reader may Determine, whether there is any Obſcurity in *M. Bines* Words; and whether there is not a poſſibility they might be taken in ſe-

veral

veral Senſes, which are, *There is a kind of Infiniteneſs in the Soul, which is not Infiniteneſs it ſelf.* If the Term *Infiniteneſs* is not Obſcure and Ambiguous, I know not what is; who is there amongſt the Sons of Men, that can ſay he hath a clear and comprehenſive Idea of *Infiniteneſs*, or of the Soul of Man? If any have, let them Demonſtrate it in intelligble Terms; if they grant they have no determinate or clear Notion of either of them, conſequently they muſt acknowledge they are Obſcure Terms; and I doubt not, but he that duly conſiders the various Subjects the Word *Infiniteneſs* may be predicated of, will not deny that it is Ambiguous, *viz. of God, his Eternal Power, Wiſdom, Goodneſs*, and alſo of all his other Attributes; beſides theſe, the Schools talk of the *Infiniteneſs of ſpace, number, duration, diviſibility of material Subſtances:* And *M. Bine* here ſpeaks of another kind, or ſpecies of Infiniteneſs, *viz.* in the Soul; but how properly, I ſhall not now Determine.

If *G. K.* intends, by ſaying *Diſputants might differ about the Subject of a Diſpute, when the Matter is Intricate and Obſcure by Ambiguities of Words*, that there is no poſſibility for them to differ about the Subject of a Diſpute; but when there is a perceptable Intricacy, Obſcurity, or Ambiguity in the Terms, I ſhall take leave to diſſent from him in this Matter: for I am induced to believe, that Opponents oftner diſagree about the Subject of the Diſpute, when they uſe common Sounds, whereof the Hearer it may be imagines it almoſt as an Affront, to ſuppoſe that he hath not the ſame preciſe determinate Idea in his Mind, that the Speaker hath in his, when he uſeth this or that familiar Term; whereas did the Hearer obſerve any Intricacy, Obſcurity, or Ambiguity in the Speaker's Words, no doubt but the Reſpondent would have the preciſe meaning of ſuch Terms, as appeared to him Obſcure and Ambiguous, ſettled, before he would proceed any further: But after the Diſputants had once agreed, what determinate Notions this or that Articulate Sound, did or ſhould for the future repreſent, it would be Morally impoſſible for them afterwards, to differ about its Signification.

Should we nicely examine the *Diſputes* now on Foot, I am apt to think a great number of them would be found to be meerly Verbal; amongſt which I am ſatisfied, ſeveral Objections that have been lately revived by *G. K.* and others againſt the

Quakers, may be enumerated. For Example, The *Quakers* ſay, *The Scriptures are not* (their Opponents ſay, *They are*) *the Word of God.* Let us but once ſettle the preciſe Conceptions, the Term **Word** excites in the *Quaker*'s Minds, and what Ideas it repreſents to their Adverſary's Intellect, when they read, or hear it pronounced; for the beſt way to determine this, is for all to explain the determinate Senſe they take it in; becauſe *Word*, ſignifies any Sound that is formed by the Organs of Speech, Account, Command, Doctrine, Jeſus Chriſt, the Eternal Word of God, *&c.* This Monoſyllable being liable to be taken in ſuch various Significations, it is no ways ſurprizing to me, that Diſputants ſhould endleſly Jangle about it, till they do actually explain the limited Senſe they take it in; when that is once determined, 'tis not doubted, but the Difference will ſoon be adjuſted.

For which Reaſon, it will not be unneceſſary for me to determine what the *Quakers* mean, when they deny that the Scriptures are the *Word of God*, being Conſcientiouſly concern'd, not to attribute that to the Scriptures, which properly belongs only to Jeſus Chriſt their Saviour, whom they (as the Scriptures) do term the *Word of God*; their Sentiments being, That the Scriptures Collectively taken, are no where, in the Old or New Teſtament, called the *Word of God*; neither can that Term, in their Opinion, properly be Predicated of any ſubſtantial Being, but of Chriſt Jeſus.

Their Adverſaries in Oppoſition to this, Affirm; That the Scriptures are the *Word of God:* but when they are deſired to demonſtrate, what they mean by the aforeſaid Terms, their Anſwer generally is, *That the Scriptures are the Words or Sayings of God, delivered to us by Holy Men Divinely inſpired.* By this & what follows, I hope it will be evident that we agree in Subſtance, tho' differ in the form of Expreſſing it; for we always have, and now do own, That the Scriptures are the Words of God, *viz. Great Myſtery*, p. 18. 68, 75, 246, 302. And in *Robert Barclay*'s Works, p. 747. We alſo Sincerely believe, that they are of *Divine Authority*, that they are a *Declaration of the Will of God*, and that they were Dictated by the *Holy Ghoſt*, ſpeaking through his Prophets, Evangeliſts and Apoſtles: this we attribute to them in a *formal Senſe*, *i. e.* as they contain the Doctrines of Truth; yet in a *material Acceptation*

ception, *i. e.* as they are Compoſed of Ink and Paper, we do not deny, but they are ſubject to Corruption.

Before I proceed any farther, I conceive it may not be impertinent for me to conſider here, the Reaſons *G. K.* advances to prove the Scriptures are the *Word of God*; becauſe in reading his Fourth Narrative, I met with a Paſſage, where he poſitively aſſerts, p. 22. *The Scriptures are the Word of God, and the Word moſt frequently ſo called in Scripture*: To confirm his Reader in a belief, that he had good Authority to prove ſo bold an Aſſertion, he cites Three Texts of Scripture out of the New Teſtament, *viz.* 1 *Theſ.* 1. 5. *John* 15. 25. *Acts* 1. 1. May I preſume to look into the 7th. page of *G. K. Presbyterian and Independent Viſible Churches* in *New England*, printed Anno 1691. I doubt not but I ſhall find *George* there in, Oppoſition to Parſon *Keith*; becauſe in that Book he poſitively ſaith, *That Logos*, 1 Theſ. 1. 5. *Signifies word of talk or diſcourſe.* Now by *Logos* there, is meant Doctrine; and that *Logos*, Acts 1. 1. Signified *Treatiſe*, but now it ſignifies *Word*; how to reconcile theſe ſeeming Contradictions of this Weather-Cock, I profeſs I am in a Quandary. On the other hand, ſhould I ſay (as it appears to me) that he is Guilty of a perfect Contradiction, he might thereby imagine that I did Inſinuate, *That he was ſtark Mad, and Crazed in his Underſtanding*; becauſe he lays it down as a Maxim, in his Preface to his Exact Narrative, *That none but ſtark mad Men, and Crazed in their Underſtanding, will hold perfect Contradictions.* Fourth Narr. p. 22.

That things may be put into a true Light, and that the Reader may be capable to judge for himſelf: I ſhall here ſubject to his Conſideration the original Texts, and their Tranſlations into *Latin*, *Dutch*, *French*, and *Engliſh*, whereby it may be the more facile for him to determine, whether *G. K.* hath not, to ſerve a turn, given them a Senſe different from all others; nay, from himſelf a few Years ſince; is not this in effect to make a Noſe of Wax, a *Lesbian* Rule, of the Scriptures, by giving them this Year one ſignification, the next a different one? What advantages this may give to the Enemies of Chriſtianity, I ſhall not now Demonſtrate. The firſt of theſe Texts is, 1 *Theſ.* 1. 5. Ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. *Quoniam Evangelium noſtrum conſtitit apud vos non locutione duntaxat, ſed etiam Virtute*

&

& *Spiritu Sancto.* **Want ons Evangelium en is onder u niet alleen in Woorden gheweest, maer ook in Kracht, ende in den heyligen Geest.** Car noſtre Predication de l'Evangile n'a point eſte en voſtre endroit ſeulement en Parole mais auſi en vertu, & en Saint Eſprit. *For our Goſpel came* (or more properly **was**) *not unto you in Word only, but alſo in Power, and in the Holy Ghoſt.* It may be obſerved, that Ἐγενήθη, is not Tranſlated *came*, in the *Latin*, *Dutch* or *French* Verſions, neither in the Bible that was Printed in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time, Anno 1578. Should I confine my ſelf ſolely to the Modern *Engliſh* Tranſlation; I do not perceive any advantage, that *G. K.* will get thereby, ſeeing the Apoſtle *Paul*'s Senſe of this Verſe, is (obvious to any unprejudiced Perſon) that the Goſpel which he Preached to the *Theſſalonians*, was not only to be believed, becauſe of the perſwaſiveneſs of the Word, Talk or Diſcourſe he made uſe of, when he Preached the Goſpel to them; but principally, becauſe the Power and Efficacy of the Holy Ghoſt accompanied it; that this is the literal Senſe of this Text, I conceive none will deny: By what figure then, this 1 *Theſ.* 1. 5. proves that all the Books of the Old and New Teſtament, are the *Word of God*, I confeſs my ſelf Ignorant, and am likely ſo to remain, unleſs *G. K.* or ſome of his Diſciples, can inform me better.

The Second Text of Scripture (that I ſhall conſider) is, *John* 15. 25, Ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ Λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν. *Sed oportet ut impleatur, Sermo qui in lege ipſorum Scriptus eſt.* **Maer (dit geſchiedt) op dat het woort vervult worde, dat in hare wet geſchreven is.** Mais c'eſt a fin-que ſoit accomplie la parole, qui eſt ecrite en leur Loi. *But this cometh to paſs, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their Law.* It is evident from all theſe Tranſlations of the *Greek* Text, that *G. K.* hath ſeen cauſe otherwiſe to word the Matter here, than either the *Latin*, *Dutch*, *French* or *Engliſh* Tranſlators have; but whether his Intentions are the ſame, I ſhall leave that to the unintereſted to determine.

As *G. K.* in his former Proof, gave us only the *Engliſh* verſion of the Text, ſo here he omitteth that, (being little for his purpoſe) and favours us only with a ſcrap of the Original, *viz.* ὁ Λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, and tranſlateth it *Written Word*, ſhould it be admitted for a Genuine interpretation (though

different from all others) of the Original, it would only prove that Sentence in their *(i. e.* the *Jews)* Law, was called the *written Word*; yet it is altogether insufficient to prove the *Bible* collectively, *i. e.* as it contains all the Books of the Old and New Testament, to be the *Word of God*: becaufe the Evangelift reftricts it here to Four Words, which are ὅτι ἐμίσησάν με δωρεὰν *they hated me without a Cauſe.* The Controverſie between *G. K.* &c. hath not been, whether one particular Sentence in the Bible, but whether all the Books therein contained, are the *Word of God*; all Citations of the Scriptures that do not prove that, are in my Opinion, far remote from the ſubject of this Diſpute: and till this is proved in *expreſs Scripture Terms* by him or ſome other, I hope he will be ſo favourable to us, as not to Stigmatize us with the Name of *Hereticks*, eſpecially if he hath not forgot what he lately ſaid, *viz.* * *I ſtill adhere to my former Advice, that nothing be required by one ſort from another, as an Article of Faith or Doctrine in common to be believed, but what is expreſly delivered in the Scriptures, in plain expreſs Scripture Terms.*

* Retract. P. 34.

The Term *Logos* is variouſly uſed, and tranſlated in the New Teſtament; *G. K.* recites * Ten different Significations it hath. Had ὁ Λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος been tranſlated in *John* 12. 25. as it in 1 *Cor.* 15. 54. *the ſaying that is written*, there would be ſcarce any ſhadow of an Argument to be deduced from that Citation, to have proved that the Scriptures are the *written Word of God*; unleſs whereſoever the Term *Written* is to be found in the Scriptures, he will ſay *Word* is there meant, tho' not expreſſed. Perchance *G. K.* may have ſo much Effrontery, as to deny that *Logos* ſignifies *Saying*; becauſe he hath not given that Senſe of it, in the Book and Page above-cited: If he will but pleaſe to Read Biſhop *Kidder's Demonſtration of the Meſſias*, there he may ſee the Biſhop affirming, that *Logos* ſignifies Saying or Thing, and tranſlating the very Words ὁ Λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, *the Saying that is Written*, or *the Thing that is Written*; tho' the *Quaker's* Affirmation may be now of little Authority with him: Yet I conceive, he will not preſume to contradict his Right Reverend Father in God, ſo call'd; but allow his *ipſe dixit* ſufficient to Patronize this Interpretation.

* Presb. and Inde. Vif. Chur. P. 7.

P. 11. P. 251.

The third and laſt Quotation (which I ſhall now examine)

10

to prove the Scriptures are the *Word of God*, is brought by him from *Acts* 1. 1. τὸν πρῶτον λόγον, *primum Librum*, het Eerſte Boeck, *Le premier Traitte*, *the former Book*; but in the Greek, ſaith *G. K.* it is *Word*: He might e'en as well have ſaid, but in Greek 'tis *Chriſt*, 'tis *Communication*, 'tis *Utterance*, 'tis *Reaſon*, 'tis *Preaching* or *Doctrine*; for λόγος is taken in all theſe and ſeveral other Significations, one whereof I remember *G. K.* makes mention of, and that is, *Treatiſe*; and quoted *Acts* 1. 1. to prove it (in a * Book he writ about ten Years ſince) notwithſtanding *G. K.* the Epiſcopalian now aſſerts the contrary, which brings to my remembrance an old Saying,

* Presb. & Inde. Vif. Churches.

☞ *Conveniet nulli qui ſecum diſſidet ipſe.* Cato.

Before I leave this ſubject concerning the Equivocalneſs of words, I ſhall conciſely Anatomize one Query *G. K.* exultantly relates he put to *John Whiting*, which was, * whether *he was of* G. Whitehead's *and* Edward Burroughs's *Faith, who ſaid, Chriſt was not in Heaven in our Nature; or that of* W. Penn's, *who ſaid, Chriſt took our Nature, and triumphed in our Nature.* 'Twill be neceſſary here, before I proceed to explain, at leaſt ſummarily, a few of the many Senſes the ambiguous Term *Nature* is uſed in, becauſe on the Equivocalneſs of that Term, is hinged the Oppoſition that *G. K.* would inſinuate there is between *G. W. E. B.* and *W. Penn.*

* Fourth Narr. p. 41.

The word *Nature* is variouſly ſenſed.

By the *School-men* it is uſed as a Synonymous Term *with God*; and is called by them, ſometimes, *Natura Naturans*; by *Seneca* 'tis affirmed, to be one of the Names of God.

By *Phyſicians* it is conſidered as an *Aggregate of Powers* exiſting in a living animal Body, as when they ſay, Nature is ſtrong, or weak; or that the Morbifick Matter is by the ſtrength of *Nature* expelled from the Center to the Circumference, as in the Eruption of the *Small Pox*, *Meaſles*, &c. and alſo for an Eſſential Property, as *Aloes* naturally Purges, *Crocus Metallorum* naturally Vomits.

By *Natural Philoſophers*, the ſettled order of things is underſtood; as *Fire* naturally burns, the *Blood* naturally circulates out of the Arteries into the Veins, after a *Summer* naturally follows a *Winter*, the Children of all Women have their ſolid

parts

parts naturally organized alike; and in the texture of their Fluids, naturally there is no visible difference.

The *Terraqueous Globe* is also comprehended under this Term, as there is no such thing in Nature, as a *Salamander*, *Phœnix*, &c.

By *Theologists*, the State our first Parents, by disobeying their Creator, fell into, wherein the Unregenerate Man now is, is typified, as the Ungodly Man is in the State of Nature, but the Godly is in the State of Grace. Besides these here recited, there are several other Significations of this ambiguous word *Nature*, too long here to be enumerated.

By what hath been said, it is certain that there is a possibility the Term *Nature* may be variously considered, and it is as clear as the Sun at Noon, from *G. Keith*'s Quotations out of their Books, that when *G. Whitehead* and *E. Burroughs* said, Christ was not in Heaven in our Nature, (as *G. K.* would infer from their words) they spoke it of sinful, wicked, Devilish Nature; but *W. Penn*, when he said Christ took our Nature, and triumphed in our Nature, considered him as the Son of *Mary*, a true and perfect Man, having a Body organized like other Men. That this was their meaning, is demonstrable from their own words, as cited by *G. K.* in his * fourth Narrative, * P. 39. where *G. Whitehead* (as the Narrator affirms) *doth severely blame* John Horne *and* Thomas More, *in his* † *He Goat's Horn*, &c. † P. 11, 12. *for saying, Christ took upon him, their* (i. e. Sinful) *Nature.* *Ed. Burroughs* is very plain, in distinguishing the subject of the Controversie, by answering his Opponent as follows, * *Thou* * *E. B.'s* *sayest in that Answer, that Christ ascended to the right hand of the* Works, *Father in your Nature: Mark now thy Nature, and your Nature, who* P. 301. *are one with thee, is sinful and wicked, and of the Devil, for so are all Lyars; and it is Blasphemy, to say sinful wicked devilish Nature—is at the right hand of God in Heaven.* If *G. K.* hath different thoughts of Christ being in Heaven, than *E. B.* here demonstrates he hath, let him plainly declare it: I do acknowledge I am not of opinion that Christ is in Heaven, in the Nature of Lyars, which is the thing *E. B.* here opposes.

W. Penn saith, That * *Jesus Christ took our Nature upon him*, * Prim. *and was like us in all things, Sin excepted.* What Shadow of Christ. a Contradiction is here in these Proofs, even as cited by *G. K.* P. 85. he that can perceive it, must have a more penetrating sight

 than

than I pretend to? I acknowledge, that I see nothing but a perfect Harmony. *G. Whitehead* blames some for saying, Christ took their (*i. e.* sinful) Nature on him: *E. Burroughs* saith, *Christ is not at the right hand of God, in that Nature which Lyars are in.* *W. Penn* saith, Christ took our (*i. e.* as he was the Seed of the Woman) Nature upon him, and was like unto us in all things, Sin excepted. The two first consider Nature as it is predicated of the Unregenerate, as they are in a State of Enmity to God: The last considers Nature, as 'tis predicated, of a Being that hath the Essential Properties of a Man, and a Body organized, as our Bodies are.

Note, *G. K.* did not propose his Question to *John Whiting* in the terms of *G. W.* who said *their Nature*; nor of *E. B.* who said *your Nature, thy Nature, his Nature*; the alteration of a material word in a Proposition, savours very much of Sophistry.

If *G. K.* had demanded an Answer of me to this Query, I am subject to believe, that I might have given him the same Reply, that *J. W.* did, tho' it may be with a distinction, *viz.* That I was of the Faith of both, for I do not favour any Opinion, that would insinuate that Christ was, or is, in Heaven, in sinful Nature: Yet I do believe that he was a true and perfect Man, not imagining Sin to be Essential to our Nature, or deducible from the abovesaid Premises, as *G. K.* would * infer, and then cry out from a false Consequence, *this is a most vile and gross Heresie.*

* Narr. p. 40.

If *G. K.* thinks I have, by saying that I am of *J. Whiting*'s Faith in this matter, *rendred my self very Ridiculous and Obnoxious to the general Censure of his Auditory*; he may rest satisfied that I am not ambitious of his Favour, experimentally knowing, that it is a discredit to be praised by some. And as for the Censure of his Auditory, some of his Associates that understood Philosophy, were ashamed of his Definition of Substance, &c. as I have been informed. But as to the Judgment of his ignorant Mobb, he may depend on it, that I never have, nor will court their Applause. Having said thus much of the Ambiguity of words in a formal Acceptation, I shall pass on to his Page 92.

4th Narr. p. 92. *I asked D. Phillips who was present, and sat near where I stood,* (this is false, for I stood amongst the Crowd, when this Query

Query was propoſed to me) *and is one in Unity with the* Quakers, *whether that Blood (that was let out of Chriſt's Side by the Spear) was in being, &c.—but he gave no reply.*

Obſer. I do not remember what Anſwer I gave to this Query, becauſe ſometimes *G. K.* would ask me one Queſtion; at the ſame time one or two of his Miniſters would ask me another; and ſometimes I anſwered one, ſometimes the other; but if I diſ-reſpected him ſo far then, as not to oblige him with an Anſwer; if he will not be Angry, nor call Names, I will do it now. My Opinion is, that the Blood which was let out of Chriſt's Side by the Soldier's Spear after he was Dead, is not now exiſting under the ſame form of Blood, as then it was: Nevertheleſs, I do not conceive, that any Particle of it is Annihilated, tho' it may be wonderfully changed, as to thoſe parts the Schools term its Accidents.

Ibid. *I asked him* (i. e. D. P.) *again, Whether he believed that the Blood that was outwardly ſhed was Meritorious to Juſtification, and that True Believers were juſtified by it? He ſaid, he knew not what I meant by the word Merit or Meritorious; I told him, It was a Shame for him to pretend to be ſo Ignorant of the Signification of the Word, that an ordinary School-Boy did know, ſeeing he was a Scholar, and did not long ago Commence Doctor of Phyſick at* Leiden, *and had there a Latin Oration.* 4th Narr. p. 92.

Obſer. The Narrator here is guilty of two Untruths, the Firſt, is in ſaying, that I ſaid, *That I did not know what he meant by Merit or Meritorious*: The Second is, *That I had a Latin Oration at* Leiden. As to the Firſt, I am ſatisfied he hath deſignedly alter'd my Words, by what he hath ſince told me; whether the Second is to be attributed ſolely to his Ignorance of the Method of that Univerſity, I ſhall not determine.

Ibid. *I asked again, Were Believers juſtified by the Merit of the Blood that was outwardly Shed?* He anſwered, *It was a part of the Offering.*

I do conceive, that that Act of the Soldiers piercing our Saviour's Side, and letting out his Blood by the Wound made by the Spear, abſtractly conſider'd, is not the Meritorious cauſe of our Salvation; but that it is the whole Offering whereby Believers are juſtified.

Ibid. *I farther asked him, what he did mean by the Offering?*

Obſerv. By the Offering I mean, what the Author to the *Hebrews* hath left on record, Chap. 9. 14, 15. in theſe words, *How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himſelf without Spot to God, purge your Conſciences from dead Works to ſerve the living God? And for this cauſe he is the Mediator of the New Teſtament, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt Teſtament, they which are called might receive the Promiſe of the eternal Inheritance.*

* P. 93. * *And on this Head alſo I queried* D. Phillips, *Whether Chriſt's Body was the ſame in Subſtance now in Heaven, that it was on Earth? And whether it was, when on Earth, a terreſtrial Body? He ſaid, he did not know what I meant by Subſtance.*

Obſerv. Here were ſome things by him ſaid, which I am apt to think ſome of his Friends have ſince acquainted him with, and ſhewed him the Abſurdity thereof, which hath inclined him ſo notoriouſly to vary the ſtate of the Query; to undeceive the Reader, I ſhall give him a more particular account thereof, which was after this manner.

G. K. Daniel, *hath Chriſt now in Heaven, the ſame Body that he had when here on Earth?*

D. P. I do deſire to know, whether thou wouldeſt have me give my Opinion, whether I do believe that Chriſt hath now in Heaven, the ſame Fleſh, Blood and Bones, that he had when here on Earth; becauſe here is a Miniſter of the Church of *England*, that told me, he did believe that Chriſt hath now in Heaven the ſame Fleſh, Blood and Bones, Stomach and Guts, that he had when here on Earth. To this he gave no anſwer, but Queried:

G. K. *Is the* Subſtance *the ſame, tho' its* Accidents *are changed?*

D. P. I have no Notion or Idea of Subſtance, without Accidents, therefore prithee give me a Definition of ſuch a Subſtance.

G. K. Subſtance *is a Being, or thing that doth depend on God Almighty, and is the ſubject of* Accidents, *&c.* As he was going on, and making an Harangue concerning Subſtance, I ſtop'd him, by ſaying,

D. P. George, this is little to the purpoſe, I only deſire a Definition of Subſtance.

G. K.

G. K. *Thou art a Fool.*

D. P. If I am a Fool, few will admire thee for propoſing thy *Queries* to me.

G. K. 'Tis a Shame for a Doctor of Phyſick to be ignorant what Subſtance *is.* Here he run into a Paſſion, and ſhewed his Admirers what a Man of Temper he was.

Min. A Miniſter reproving him, ſaid, *Perſonal Reflections are not commendable.* Another Miniſter endeavouring to divert me from the Subject under debate, ſaid, *The Definition of* Subſtance *is little to the purpoſe.*

D. P. How can any Perſon poſitively determine, whether any Subſtance is the ſame, when all its Accidents are changed, unleſs he can have a diſtinct Idea of Subſtance, ſeparated from its Accidents? Here *G. K.* having a little moderated his Paſſion, replied,

G. K. *Subſtance is a created Being:*

D. P. So are Accidents created Beings.

G. K. *They are produced Beings.* And preſently deſiſted Querying, and went on another Subject.

Obſerv. Here are three things that I ſhall briefly conſider: Firſt, The Abſurdity of this Clergy-man's Reſurrection. Secondly, How G. K. treats his Opponents. Thirdly, The Learnedneſs of G. K's Definition of Subſtance.

As to the firſt, Thoſe that do aſſert, that Chriſt hath now in Heaven, the ſame *Fleſh*, *Blood* and *Bones*, that he had when here on Earth; do conſequentially grant, that every Man, at the Reſurrection, ſhall have the ſame numerical Particles vitally re-united to his Soul, that he had at the time of his Death: If this is admitted, then it neceſſarily follows, that he that died an Infant, ſhall riſe in Stature like an Infant; he that dyes Hydropical, ſhall riſe with a Belly not much leſs than a Tun; he that dyes of a Conſumption, ſhall riſe extreamly emaciated, reſembling a Skeleton; he that dies without his Legs and Arms, ſhall ariſe without them; and he that dies Gibbous, ſhall ariſe Hunch-back'd. This is ſo groſs an Opinion of the Reſurrection, that I am ſubject to believe G. K. doth not incline to Patronize any ſuch Carnal Notions of the Reſurrection of the Dead, tho' he did not condemn it in his Brother Prieſt, who ſaid, at *Turners-Hall*, that he believed Chriſt was now in Heaven, with the ſame Stomach, Guts, *&c.* that might be out of Policy, not being willing

willing to disoblige any of them, into whose Society he daily expected to be initiated.

Secondly, As to his Civility towards his *quondam* Friends, if he dislikes their Discourse, being, perhaps, better Orators than himself, he orders his Janisaries to pull them down, if they do not do it without a Command; as soon as they are down, they are hurried out of Doors with Violence, scarce admitting them to speak a word in their own defence, altho' it may be he bespatters them at the same time with some personal Reflections. Thus *Thomas Kent* was served at *Turners-Hall*, a partial account thereof may be seen in the ninth Page: Other times, tho' (it may be) he was the Aggressor, he will complement them with the grateful Titles of Fool, Madman, Lyar, *&c.* especially when he is foiled by his Opponent.

He will not be more Civil when he invites them into his Friends House: In confirmation hereof, I will give the Reader a brief account, how he treated me. A few days after his pretended fourth Narrative came out, I writ to him, intimating, that he had grosly misrepresented me, desiring his Answer; but with none could I be favoured to this day. Some time after, I accidentally met him in *Lombard*; He told me, that he had received my Letter, and if he had done me any Wrong, he would give me Satisfaction; inviting me into his Booksseller's Shop; without any Hesitation I followed him, where some of his Fraternity were, who would have Catechised me. I replied, I am come in with *G. K.* in order to receive Satisfaction from him, for some things he hath Printed concerning me, in his last *Narrative*; I charged him with misrepresenting me first, in Page 21. concerning his Book, called, *The Way Cast up*; and shewed them what he said concerning it, in the Defence of the *Snake*, how that Book was approved by a *Meeting* of *Friends*, and that by his own Concession then, there was no *Meeting*, but the *Second-days-Meeting*, that did authorize Books; consequentially it could be no great Lye in any Person (that had read his Books) to say, that his Book, called, *The Way Cast up*, was approved by the *Second-days-Meeting*, they assented to it. I also there told him, That I did not say, that I did not knowwhat *Meritorius* signified. He replied, He thought I meant so. I told him,

If

If he had done candidly by me, he ſhould have given my own Words, and not his Conjectures of my Meanings. Inſiſting a little warmly on this Subject, to clear himſelf of this apparent Forgery, he ſaid, He did verily believe that I ſpoke as 'Twas Printed. I replied, 'Twas abominable Falſe: He fell into an Exorbitant Paſſion, calling me *Mad-man*, *Liar*, &c. One that belonged to the Shop, ſeeing the little Man in ſo great a Diſorder, and People gathering about the Shop-door, pulled me from the place I ſtood, and with violence thruſt me into the Street. Perchance ſome may have ſo favourable Opinions of him, as to ſay, he did not order his Friends to abuſe me: To them my Anſwer is, Neither did he reprove them in my hearing, for their Incivilities, which in ſome Mens Judgment, is a tacit Approbation.

Thirdly, What concerns his Definition of *Subſtance*, it is deficient, having no *differentia ſpecifica*, whereby one Claſſis of *Beings*, is diſcriminated from another. But why ſhould I ſpend time in anatomizing the Defectiveneſs, &c. of his Definition, when it is obvious to all that know the Nature of a Definition: I could not have imagined, that *G. K.* who would be eſteemed a *Philoſopher*, would have entertained his Auditory with ſuch a nauſeous Diſh of *Philoſophy*. Perhaps ſome, may think I am too Cenſorious, that are of Opinion he is introducing a new Syſtem of *Philoſophy*, from his ſaying at *Turners-Hall*, *My* Philoſophy *teacheth me this, and my* Philoſophy *teacheth me that*. Whatever Sentiments any of his Admirers may have, of his *Philoſophy*, I ſhall have a mean Eſteem of it, till I have ſeen a Vindication of his late Definition of *Subſtance*, &c.

Ibid. *I ask'd him* (*i. e.* D. P.) *again, Was our Lord's Body Earthly when it was on Earth?*

D. P. It was like unto *ours* in all things, Sin excepted.

G. K. But was it *Earthly* or *Terreſtrial?*

D. P. The Scriptures are very plain in this matter, for which reaſon I do not conceive there is any neceſſity for me to uſe any *Unſcriptural Terms*; nevertheleſs I do ſincerely believe, *that it was* (as the Scripture ſays) *like ours in all things, Sin excepted.*

Min. By his confeſſing it was like *ours*, he hath confeſſed it was an *Earthly Body.*

G. K.

G. K. *To them that are Sound in the Faith, 'tis so, but not to the* Quakers; *for they will not allow, that an Earthly Body, and a Heavenly Body, can be the same in Substance; or that a Natural Body, and a Spiritual Body, are the same in* Substance.

Obs. The unsettled Sense of this Term *Substance*, is, as I conceive, the sole Cause of several Differences that arises amongst them, that Discourse about it: Those that have not been *Tinctured* with the *Notions* of the *Schools*, concerning *Substance*, consider it as a material *Being*, having *Length*, *Breadth*, *Thickness*, *Figure*, *Colour*, and as a thing Cognizable to the *External Senses*. *G. K.* and the *School-men* talk of it, as a *Being* that hath neither *Length*, *Breadth*, *Thickness*, *Figure*, *Colour*, nor as an *Object* perceptible by the *Eye*, &c. but only as a *Substratum* of certain *Qualities*, commonly called *Accidents:* But what this *Substratum* is, I never could yet meet with any that could give me a *clear distinct Idea* of it.

If *G. K.* hath a clear, distinct, and comprehensive *Idea* of the Term *Substance*, and would communicate it to *G. W.* it is very probable their Notions about it, might easily be reconciled; but if one talks of it as a Creature of the Mind, invented by the *Schools*, to support their Notions of *Accidents*, actually existing, *per se*, no where, unless it doth in the Mind, as *Substance* distinct from all *Accidents* really doth not: And the other considers it only as a visible material Being, as the Scripture does, *Gen.* 7. 4. They may endlesly dispute about it, till the precise Signification of that *Term* is settled, when that is done, this Controversie may then appear to be a Strife, meerly thro' the Ambiguity of words.

Ibid. *I told the Auditory, how the* Quakers *Ignorance, and False Notions of* Philosophy, *destroyed their Faith, and hindered them to believe that necessary and Fundamental Article of the Christian Faith, that Christ's Body that he had on Earth, is the same in Substance it was in Heaven—for if it is not the same in Substance, it is in no respect the same.*

Obs. We are not of the Opinion of a great Man among the *Romans*, who said, If they had been deprived of *Aristotle's Philosophy*, they should have wanted several *Articles* of their *Faith*. We do not esteem *Heathenish Philosophy* Essential to our Religion, neither do we matter how Ignorant we are in that, our principal Care being to make our *Calling* and *Election* sure.

That

That the Quakers Ignorance, and falſe Notions of Philoſophy, *deſtroyed their Faith, G. K.* dogmatically aſſerteth; but how doth he prove it? Why he ſaith, *They do not believe that Chriſt's Body, that he had on Earth, is the ſame in Subſtance it was in Heaven.* How doth he make out, that the Sameneſs of a *Spiritual Body*, which was once a *Natural Body*, conſiſts only in its Subſtance; may not his *ipſe dixit* (when ſupported with a great Aſſurance) be credited? Then he hath another notable Argument, which is reſerved till laſt, and probably, as he thinks, the moſt concluſive, *viz. If it be not the ſame in Subſtance, it is in no reſpect the ſame.* How precarious is this *Fundamental Article* of the *Chriſtian Faith* (as *G. K.* terms it) if it hath no better a Foundation, than an If to ſupport it?

I have two Queries to propoſe to *G. K.* on this Head, to which I ſhall expect his Anſwer, when he thinks fit to reply.

Firſt, I deſire him to demonſtrate, Wherein the *Sameneſs* of a *Natural Body* doth conſiſt? Becauſe, if he cannot demonſtrate wherein that conſiſts, I ſhall give little heed to what he magiſterially aſſerteth, concerning the *Identity* of a *Spiritual Body.*

Secondly, Whether he doth apply the Term *Subſtance, to God, finite Spirits, and Body*, in the ſame, or different Significations? If it ſtands for the ſame *Idea*, when it is predicated of ſo different *Subjects*; Whether it will not follow, that *God, Spirits and Body*, agree in the ſame common name of *Subſtance*? Which, in my Opinion, is a very odd *Doctrine.* But if he ſaith, it ſtands for three different *Idea's*; for one, as *God* is ſaid to be a *Subſtance*; for another, as an *Angel* is ſaid to be a *Subſtance*; and for a third, as *Matter* is called a *Subſtance.* Then I ſhall deſire him to make known, how we may diſtinguiſh theſe ſeveral Kinds of *Subſtances*, becauſe, without knowing what preciſe Idea's *Subſtance* ſtands for, it is impoſſible to diſcourſe about it intelligibly.

Whatever *G. K.* and his *Aſſociates* falſely inſinuate, the *Quakers* ſincerely believe, that the *ſame Jeſus Chriſt*, which died without the *Gates of Jeruſalem*, is riſen from the Dead, and aſcended into Heaven, from whence he will, at the laſt day, come with Glory and Majeſty, and Judge the Living and the

Dead, according to their Deeds done in the Body. The Subſtance of this, I told G. K. at *Turners-Hall*, was my Faith. To this he replied, *Thou art no more a* Quaker *than I am; to ſay Thee and Thou, and not to pull off the Hat, makes a* Quaker. This Paſſage I do not find in his Narrative, whether it was omitted *deſignedly*, or *accidentally*, he is beſt able to inform the *Queriſt*.

We likewiſe believe the *Reſurrection of the Dead*, both of the *Juſt*, and of the *Unjuſt*; tho' we do not poſitively determine, what Qualities, *&c.* are altered, or what remains the ſame, when a *Natural Body* is changed into a *Spiritual Body*; therefore we determine nothing magiſterially, concerning the Change the *Reſurrection Body* ſhall receive at the Sound of the *laſt Trumpet*; but what the *Holy Ghoſt* hath been pleaſed to reveal in the Scriptures, *viz. That this Corruptible, ſhall put on Incorruption; that this Mortal, ſhall put on Immortality.*

How great an Alteration there is in a *Corruptible Body*, when it hath put on *Incorruption*; or in a *Mortal Body*, when it hath put on *Immortality*; I am not aſhamed to acknowledge my Ignorance therein.

With what *Body* ſhall the *Dead* ariſe? was a *Query* in the Apoſtle *Paul*'s time: What Anſwer he gave the curious Inquirer then, may be ſeen 1 *Cor.* 15. 36, *&c.* and may alſo ſerve G. K. now, *Thou Fool, that which thou ſoweſt is not quickned, except it die. And that which thou ſoweſt, thou ſoweſt not that body that ſhall be, but bare grain, it may chance of Wheat, or of ſome other grain. But God giveth it a body, as it hath pleaſed him.* An Anſwer, that, in my Opinion, ſhould deter all Chriſtians from determining any thing Dogmatically, wherein the *Sameneſs* of the *Reſurrection Body*, doth, or doth not conſiſt; conceiving that, we ſhould reſt ſatisfied in what the Scriptures ſay on this ſubject, which is, *That the Dead ſhall ariſe.*

1 Cor. 15. 36, &c.

1 Cor. 15. In this Chapter the Apoſtle diſcourſeth very largely concerning the *Reſurrection of the Dead*, yet ſeemeth very cautious here in wording his matter about it; neither in this Chapter, nor in any other place of his Writings, affirming, *in totidem terminis, the Reſurrection of the Same Body*: But where he ſpeaks of the Reſurrection, he doth not ſay, of the *dead bodies*, but ſimply of the *Dead*, as ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, the *Reſurrection of the Dead*; not ἀνάστασις τῶν σωμάτων τῶν νεκρῶν, the Reſurrection of the

1 Cor. 15. 13.

the Bodies of the Dead; εἰ νεκροὶ (not νεκρὰ) οὐκ ἐγείρονται, if the Dead are not risen; οἱ κεκοιμημένοι (not τὰ κεκοιμημένα) they that sleep πάντες (not πάντα) ζωοποιηθήσονται, all shall be made alive: Here is νεκροὶ οἱ πάντες, two *Adjectives* and an *Article*, all three of the *Masculine Gender*; if they had any reference to σώματα, *Bodies*, they must have been of the *Neuter*; whereby it demonstratively follows, the *Apostle* did not predicate these Terms of *Bodies*; neither do I find in any place of my *Bible*, in expres words, the *Resurrection of the* **Same Body** affirmed. Ver. 16. Ver. 18. Ver. 22.

It hath always been our principal Concern, to word our Discourses (especially when we speak of the *Principles* of our *Faith*) as much as may be in *Scripture-Terms*; if others did the like, we are inclined to believe, there would be more *Love* and *Unity* amongst the *Professors of Christianity*, than now there are. We think it a great piece of *Presumption*, and *Arrogance*, in any Mortal, *Dictator-like*, positively to determine, wherein the **Sameness** of a **Natural Body**, when it is changed into a **Spiritual Body**, doth, and wherein it doth not consist. As *G. K.* confidently affirmeth, that * the *Change* was not in *Substance*, but in *Accidents*: *For* (saith he) *Take away the* Substance *of any thing, and no* Accidents *can remain of any thing*. Suppose I should say, Take away all the *Accidents* from a *Material Substance*, and what remains, *G. K.* may put in his Eye, without injuring his Sight, not doubting to prove this my Supposition, when *G. K.* in intelligible words, demonstrateth the Truth of his *Assertion*? But wherein to place the **Sameness** of a **Spiritual Substance**, that was once a **Natural One**, we suspend dictating any thing positively concerning it; conceiving that we shall never have a certain, adequate and comprehensive *Notion*, of the *Qualities* of a **Resurrection-Body**, till the last Day, we actually experience it in our selves. * P. 93.

Nevertheless, tho' we do not affect *School-Terms*, which have been Midwiv'd into the World by *Heathen Philosophers*, as *Substance* and *Accidents*; nor Magisterially determine, wherein the **Identity** of the **Resurrection-Body** shall consist; yet we do unfainedly believe, as our ancient Friend *J. Crook*, in his Treatise, called, *Truth's Principles*, Printed *Anno* 1663, saith, *The Dead, shall be raised with the same Bodies, as far as a Natural and Spiritual, Corruptible and Incorruptible, Terrestrial and Celestial, can be the same.*

Having thus answered what is said concerning me in *G. K's Fourth Narrative*, I submit to the unbiassed Reader's Determination, how great his Victory is, and what Reason he hath so Boastingly to say, *That in all his Answers he* (i. e. *D. P.*) *gave on this, or other Heads, he greatly foyled himself.* In the Opinion of some, this Boast had been more becoming a Man that had put off his Armour, than one that is putting it on.

Page 92.

POSTSCRIPT.

BEsides what is related by *G. K.* in his *Narrative*, concerning his Discourse with me, there are several things omitted; and I remember, among other things, he told his *Auditory* after this manner.

G. K. *It is a Custom among the* Quakers, *to advise their Proselytes to read none of their Adversaries Books.*

D. P. That is False, *George.*

Min. *How long have you been a* Quaker?

D. P. My Parents were *Quakers*, and I may denominate my self one from my *Cradle*, being always educated in the way of Truth; and in all my Life, I never heard any such Caution given to me, or to any other Person.

Obser. Had this been a General *Maxim*, I am confident, I should not have lived so long in Ignorance of it, having had the Curiosity for several Years, to read most *Books* that were Printed against the *Quakers*, not privately, but publickly, even in the presence of some of their *Chiefest Preachers*; but never was blamed for so doing, nor advised to the contrary by any of them. *G. K.* would not oblige me a little, if he would favour me so far, as to tell me, how many he had advised, not to read *Adversaries Books*, in 25 or 30 Years that he was amongst them; it is not to be doubted, but if it was a common *Method*, he (who thought himself not one of the least of their *Advocates*) can remember some of them by Name, to whom he gave such *Advice*; if he doth not give us the Name of one of our *Friends*, now in Fellowship with us, it will be reputed by me, as a *Fiction* of his own *Brain.*

As,

As *G. K.* was giving his Auditory an account of the extraordinary Succeſs he had, in reclaiming the *Quakers* from their *Groſs Errors*, as he falſly calls them, I put one *Query* to him, he having propoſed ſeveral to me before; and this is the only *Query*, as I remember, that I ſtarted all the time I was there, after he had been glorying in the number of his *Proſelytes* about *Reading*!

D. P. Now thou haſt given us an account of thy *Proſelytes* at *Reading*, Prithee let us know how many thou haſt in other places?

G. K. *About* Huntington *there is* Robert Bridgeman *and* Margaret Everard, *who was a noted Preacher amongſt the* Quakers.

D. P. Now thou haſt given us a Catalogue of thy Country *Proſelytes*, Prithee give us an account of thy *City Converts*? Here he demurred, and tho' urged to give an Anſwer; yet would not name one, being aſhamed (as I am ſubject to believe) publickly to own, that he had not got one *Quaker* (who was in Fellowſhip with *Friends*, when he came to *England*, and had not forfeited it by ſome Irregular Act) to joyn with him in expoſing of their *quondam Friends* in this *populous City*.

Obſer. The number of his *Proſelytes* are in reality, (whatever he Bounces) very ſmall, if ſuch only as were in Fellowſhip with the *Quakers*, and owned by them as ſuch (when he came into *England*) were enumerated; all theſe, I am fully ſatisfied, will not exceed the number of his *Narratives*, which are but *Four*: But if all thoſe who have been ejected their *Society*, for ſome notorious *Immoralities*, &c. ſhould be included, the number would be greater, by his carrying away thoſe *rotten Branches*, they freely acknowledge; and are apt to think, he would have no great cauſe to boaſt, if he could perſwade more ſuch to unite themſelves to his *Lax Communion*, becauſe by their *Scandalous Lives*, when amongſt *Friends*, they brought a publick Diſrepute to their *Holy Profeſſion*. I ſaw one of *G. K's* chiefeſt Converts at his right hand, on the Stage at *Turners-Hall* (when *G. K.* was Comically delivering his laſt *Narrative*) who had been baniſhed their *Society*, for Actions that were extreamly *Scandalous*.

Tho' *G. K.* omits reciting the Number and Names of his new Adherents in its proper place, yet in the *Poſtſcript* I obſerve, there is mention made of *Two Men*, *and as many Women*.

Women, that he hath been instrumental in reconciling to the Church of *England*, so called, viz. *Robert Bridgeman*, *Margaret Everard*, *William Mather* and his Wife; the two first we shall not deny, that they were once reputed as our *Friends*: But as for *William Mather*, we have not owned him as one these many Years, long since he appeared publickly in Print against us. It is much, that he, who hath been so Industrious these *five or six Years*, to Sow the *Seeds of Dissention* amongst the *Quakers*, in all that time, should not be able to nominate **four** of that Communion by Name, who were once reputed ones; but to fill up that Number, should be forced to crowd in *William Mather*, an elder Adversary, than himself.

Should the Benefit and Prejudice be weighed in equal Scales, wherewith *G. K.* hath affected the *Quakers*; I am well satisfied, the former will considerably out-ballance the latter. He did them a *notable Service*, *First*, In dividing the *Separate Meeting* in *Harp-lane*, whereby it was dissolved; upon its Dissolution, several of its *Members*, that were honest and well-meaning People, returned to *Truth* and their former *Friends*. *Secondly*, By carrying away some scandalous and disorderly Persons, whose *Immoralities*, *&c.* were a daily Exercise to them. *Thirdly*, By freeing them from some turbulent and unruly *Members*, that did too often disturb the Quiet of their *Meetings*. Now these are become *Nominal Members* of another Society, they presume that their *Immoralities* will never more be thrown in their Teeth. *Fourthly*, By his *Clamours*, he hath excited a Curiosity in some, to read their Books; who probably without them, would never have been so Inquisitive: And in others, to go to their Publick Meetings, to hear and see for themselves; who have thereby been so entirely well satisfied in their *Principles*, that many lately, of several *Professions*, have united themselves to their *Communion*.

FINIS.

Books Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle*, in *White-Hart-Court* in *Gracious-ſtreet*, and at the *Bible* in *Leaden-Hall-ſtreet*, 1700.

TRuth and Innocency Vindicated; and the People, called *Quakers*, Defended, in Principle and Practice, againſt Invidious Attempts and Calumnies. Being a Juſt Examination of two Books againſt the ſaid People, Entituled, I. A Brief Diſcovery, *&c.* by three *Norfolk* Prieſts. II. Some few of the *Quakers* many Horrid Blaſphemies, *&c.* Being a Scandalous Libel. Containing alſo many of the Repeated Abuſes in *John Meriton's* Antidote, and *Francis Bugg's* Pilgrim's Progreſs. Examined by G. *Whitehead*, a Servant of Chriſt. Price Stitch'd 9 *d.*

The Rector Examined, About his Book Scandalouſly ſtiled, An Antidote againſt the Venom of *Quakeriſm*, By *John Meriton*, who calls himſelf A. M. Rector of *Boughton* in *Norfolk*. And his Obſervations Remarked, and the Chriſtianity of the People, commonly called *Quakers*, Re-aſſerted and Vindicated, from his Perverſions and Aſſertions. By *George Whitehead*. Price Stitch'd 6 *d.*

A Rambling Pilgrim, or Profane Apoſtate, Expoſed: Being an Anſwer to Two Perſecuting Books, Falſly Entitled, I. The Pilgrim's Progreſs from Quakeriſm to Chriſtianity. II. A Modeſt Defence. With an Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Bountiful Benefactors. By *G. W.* a Servant of Chriſt. Price Stitch'd 6 *d.*

The Creed-Forgers Detected, in Reply to a Pamphlet, Falſly called, The Quakers Creed, containing Twelve Articles, Publiſhed by ſome, who have not joyned with *Geo. Keith* in his Pride and Contradiction, but Teſtifie againſt both him, and them that joyn with him therein. Price Stitch'd 2 *d.*

Some Obſervations on the Remarks upon the *Quakers*: Or, the Buſie Prieſt's Envy Detected, and Folly Manifeſted; and his poor Ability for his Languiſhing Church proved Ineffectual. Price Stitch'd 3 *d.*

The Weakneſs of *George Keith's* Reaſons for Renouncing *Quakeriſm*, and entering into Communion with the Church of *England*, &c. Manifeſted, and Replied to. By *John Feild*. Price Stitch'd 3 *d.*

Robert Bridgman's Reaſons for leaving the *Quakers*, (upon Examination) proved Unreaſonable; being only a Demonſtration of his Envy. By *W. Rawlinſon*. Price Stitch'd 3 *d.*

Mercy

The Tryal of Spirits both in Teachers and Hearers. Wherein is held forth the clear Diſcovery, and certain Downfal, of the Carnal and Antichriſtian Clergy of theſe Nations. Teſtified from the Word of God, to the Univerſity Congregations of *Cambridge*. Whereunto is added, a plain and neceſſary Confutation of divers Groſs Errors, delivered by Mr. *Sydrach Sympſon*, in a Sermon preached to the ſame Congregation at the Commencement, *Anno* MDCLIII. Wherein (among other things) is declared, that the Univerſities (according to their preſent Statutes and Practices) are not (as he affirmed) anſwerable to the Schools of the Prophets in the time of the Law; but rather to the Idolatrous High Places. And that Humane Learning is not a Preparation appointed by Chriſt, either for the right Underſtanding, or right Teaching the Goſpel. With a brief Teſtimony againſt Divinity-Degrees in the Univerſities. As alſo *Luther*'s Teſtimony at large upon the whole Matter. And laſtly, The right Reformation of Learning, Schools and Univerſities, according to the State of the Goſpel and the Light that ſhines therein. All neceſſary for the Inſtruction and Direction of the Faithful in theſe laſt times. By *William Dell*, Miniſter of the Goſpel, and Maſter of *Gonvil* and *Caius* College in *Cambrige*. Price Bound 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

The Defence of the People called *Quakers*: Being a Reply, to a Book lately publiſhed by certain Prieſts of the County of *Norfolk*, under the pretended Title of *The Quakers Challenge*. And containing ſome brief and modeſt Animadverſions upon the Book it ſelf. Several Certificates, which Detect the Errors in thoſe of *Weſt-Dereham*, and Clear the People called *Quakers* of the ſaid Challenge. The Letters that paſſed between Them and the Prieſts. Price Stitch'd 6 *d.*

No Groſs, No Crown. A Diſcourſe, ſhewing the Nature and Diſcipline of the Holy Groſs of Chriſt. By *W. Penn.* In Two Parts. The Fifth Edition. Price Bound 3 *s.*

The Harmony of Divine and Heavenly Doctrines, Demonſtrated in ſundry Declarations on Variety of Subjects. Preached at the *Quakers* Meetings in *London*, by Mr. *W. Penn*, Mr. *G. Whitehead*, Mr. *S. Waldenfield*, Mr. *B. Coole*, Taken in Short-hand as it was delivered by them; and now Faithfully Tranſcribed and Publiſhed for the Information of thoſe, who, by reaſon of Ignorance, may have received a Prejudice againſt them. By a Lover of that People. Price Bound 1 *s.* 6 *d.*